

REMARKS

The Examiner objected to claims 29-40 allegedly "because line 24 of claim 29 appears to be a typo. The text of this line is identical to the text found in line 18 and appears to be an oversight from amending the claim." Applicants agree with the Examiner and have amended claim 29 to delete the duplicated line resulting from a typo.

The Examiner rejected claims 32-40 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The Examiner rejected claims 29-40 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Gundewar et al. (US Patent 6,381,610) in view of Oka (US Patent 5,537,591) and Examiner's Official Notice.

Applicants respectfully traverse the §112 and §103 rejections with the following arguments.

35 U.S.C. §112

The Examiner rejected claims 32-40 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly "being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.... In each of the claims 32-40, in line 3 of each claim, it is unclear how the tasks listed are "accomplished." The claims state that the "generating and displaying" of the view and templates "accomplishes" specific tasks which are recited in each claim. It is unclear in each of these claims if the claimed program storage device is being claimed as a tool to carry out these functions, or if the device generates on its own the claimed list of activities merely by "generating and displaying" the view and templates. For example, it is unclear how the generating and displaying of the views and templates use the GP/AP system by itself. Does the generating and displaying of these views and templates perform the payroll by itself?"

In response, Applicants have amended claims 32-40 to clarify the invention and to resolve the questions raised by the Examiner.

35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner rejected claims 29-40 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Gundewar et al. (US Patent 6,381,610) in view of Oka (US Patent 5,537,591) and Examiner's Official Notice.

Applicants respectfully contend that claim 29 is not unpatentable over Gundewar in view of Oka, because Gundewar in view of Oka does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 29. For example, Gundewar in view of Oka does not teach or suggest "wherein said folders and views section, said task title display and selection area, said summary task creation button, and said detailed task creation button visually appear together in a single contiguous display area within said playbook summary view". The preceding feature of claim 29 is embodied in FIG. 4 of the present patent application. Gundewar does not teach or suggest a single contiguous display area within which a folders and views section, a task title display and selection area, a summary task creation button, and a detailed task creation button visually appear together.

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that claim 29 is not unpatentable over Gundewar in view of Oka, and that claim 29 is in condition for allowance. Since claims 30-40 depend from claim 29, Applicants contend that claims 30-40 are likewise in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully believe that all pending claims and the entire application meet the acceptance criteria for allowance and therefore request favorable action. If the Examiner believes that anything further would be helpful to place the application in better condition for allowance, Applicants invites the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below.

Date: 05/05/2004

Jack P. Friedman
Jack P. Friedman
Registration No. 44,688

Schmeiser, Olsen & Watts
3 Lear Jet Lane, Suite 201
Latham, New York 12110
(518) 220-1850

09/444,254

10